

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.

MEETING
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD
STRATEGIC POLICY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Joe Serna Jr., CalEPA Building
1001 I Street
2nd Floor
Coastal Hearing Room
Sacramento, California

Tuesday, June 9, 2009
10:12 a.m.

HE SUK JONG
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
LICENSE NUMBER 12918

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.

A P P E A R A N C E S

BOARD MEMBERS

Ms. Margo Reid Brown, Chair

Ms. Sheila Kuehl

Mr. John Laird

Ms. Carole Migden

Ms. Rosalie Mulé

STAFF

Mr. Mark Leary

Mr. Elliot Block

Ms. Tracey Cottingim

Ms. Kristen Garner

Mr. Howard Levenson

Ms. Rubia Packard

Mr. Ted Rauh

Ms. Brenda Smyth

ALSO PRESENT

Mr. Evan Edgar, California Refuse Recycling Council

Mr. Nick Lapis, Californians Against Waste

Mr. John Nuffer, Advisor to Ms. Migden

--oOo--

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.

I N D E X

	Page
I. ROLL CALL	1
II. PUBLIC COMMENT	6
III. ADJOURNMENT	36
IV. REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	38
A. Program Directors' Report	--
C. Consideration of Revisions to the 2009 CIWMB Strategic Directives to Address Climate Change - (Board Item 11) - CONSENT AGENDA ITEM	36

--o0o--

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Good morning. Welcome
2 to the June 9th meeting of the Strategic Policy
3 Committee.

4 For those of you in the audience, there are
5 agendas on the back table. If anyone would like to
6 speak to our item, please bring a speaker slip to
7 Kristen. I would like to remind everybody to turn
8 their cell phones off or put them in the vibrate mode.

9 Kristen, can you call the roll.

10 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT GARNER: Kuehl?

11 BOARD MEMBER KUEHL: Here.

12 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT GARNER: Laird?

13 BOARD MEMBER LAIRD: Here.

14 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT GARNER: Migden?

15 BOARD MEMBER MIGDEN: Here.

16 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT GARNER: Mulé?

17 BOARD MEMBER MULÉ: Here.

18 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT GARNER: Brown?

19 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Here.

20 For our agenda today, we have pulled Item B
21 from the agenda, so today's meeting we will be
22 considering Item C, the revision to the strategic
23 directives.

24 And I'll ask any members if they have any ex
25 partes to report.

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 (No audible response.)

2 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Okay. We're up-to-date.

3 And are we doing a little presentation on
4 this, kind of? It came from John and me. John and I
5 presented it.

6 MR. LEARY: Program staff will do a
7 presentation. And as I look on page 3, program staff
8 is Margo Reid Brown and John Laird.

9 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Well, isn't that
10 wonderful.

11 BOARD MEMBER KUEHL: Can't wait.

12 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Oh, don't hold your
13 breath.

14 Actually, I will, as a means to start this
15 discussion and for our audience listening and here,
16 mention that at the Board retreat this year, the Board
17 discussed all the activity and our integral role in
18 Global Warming Solutions Act and the role we play in
19 implementation of the governor's global warming
20 climate reduction and how important it was to capture
21 what we are currently doing and to set the stage for
22 opportunities for the future.

23 So what we've done in the first step is pull
24 together what is in our strategic directives currently
25 to set out what our mission and our core value

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 statement should look like, capture initially what we
2 are currently doing, and look for opportunities to
3 move the ball farther as far as climate change and
4 reductions that are associated with those parts, so
5 the scoping plan and what we do here at the Board.

6 So what we offer is an initial starting
7 point for discussion, and I will defer to Brenda and
8 Howard if there's some parts of what we've put
9 together that you want to chime in, discuss, add to.

10 BOARD MEMBER LAIRD: Madam Chair?

11 CHAIRPERSON Brown: John.

12 BOARD MEMBER LAIRD: If maybe I can add
13 before we get to that, because I think -- the Chair
14 just did a very good job of stating how we got here
15 and what this is. And I think the real issue in many
16 ways is the fact that we have had certain statutory
17 duties from which we experience lower emissions. And
18 how do we, in the advent of AB 32, move from more a
19 top-down statement that, regardless of how everything
20 comes to us individually, how do we want to have the
21 systematic and coordinated way within our assigned
22 statutory duties to reduce emissions?

23 And one of the things that's also worth
24 noting is the governor submitted a budget change
25 proposal this year to redirect funds within the Waste

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 Board budget to create six positions to assist us with
2 this. And the interesting thing is -- because there
3 was a little blip for a while, legislatively, before
4 both houses concurred in that recommendation. And
5 it's worth mentioning right here because it was that,
6 while it might have been our statutory duty to do
7 these things over the last 20 years, it was never the
8 intent in 1989 that we have staff positions that count
9 exactly what the level of emissions are that are saved
10 or involved in things that we do.

11 And with that budget change, providing it
12 stays in the budget all the way, that duty and ability
13 to achieve it would be added to the Waste Board so
14 that it's not just that we would have what we're about
15 to discuss here and maybe even amend a little in our
16 strategic directive on climate change, but we would be
17 able to actually implement it by way of counting.

18 So I think this is really important, and the
19 thing -- I've done some interviews, obviously, about
20 the Waste Board lately. And one of the things that's
21 interesting is that we probably as a state agency did
22 as much to reduce greenhouse gases in our normal order
23 of things before the baseline was set by AB 32, and so
24 that's just additional context for this discussion.

25 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Right.

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 BOARD MEMBER LAIRD: And I would just
2 acknowledge that we did have in committee the
3 PowerPoint presentation on AB 32 last month or the
4 month before in a way that we asked significant
5 questions and sort of gave some general feedback on
6 these issues more practically.

7 Thank you for the chance to comment at the
8 beginning of this time.

9 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: I apologize. We're
10 doing this together. I should have deferred to you
11 immediately.

12 We do have a couple of speakers. I don't
13 know, do you -- Brenda and Howard, do you have
14 anything to add as we look at this and discuss this?

15 MR. LEVENSON: Howard Levenson with the
16 Sustainability Program.

17 And I think you and Member Laird have
18 captured the intent of this. These reflect a lot of
19 the things that we are doing or planning to do and
20 that we're obligated to do under the scope and plan,
21 but this brings it together into a broader social
22 context, I think, and I think elevates the importance
23 of it, which is one of the things that we all need to
24 do in these activities.

25 Member Laird mentioned the budget issues.

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 That is a critical issue in terms of resources to
2 implement this. And, of course, some of the
3 contracting issues that we are going to be facing in
4 the next year, given the governor's executive order,
5 are likely to impact this as well, so we're going to
6 have to do some scrambling. But we do intend to be
7 reporting back to you periodically on how things are
8 going with this and will seek your direction on that
9 as well.

10 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: We do have two speakers,
11 so I will invite our first speaker Evan Edgar,
12 engineer.

13 MR. EDGAR: Madam Chair, Members of the
14 Board, my name is Evan Edgar, California Refuse
15 Recycling Council. I'm a civil engineer at Edgar
16 Associates, and I'm highly supportive of what the
17 Waste Board is doing today. Last month --

18 (Interruption by the reporter.)

19 MR. EDGAR: I have more than two minutes; I
20 can slow down.

21 Last month CARB adopted the low carbon fuel
22 standard. And as part of it, we testified on needing
23 to have MSW-derived feedstocks as part of that. You
24 have urban, you have forestry, and you have
25 agriculture and a lot of activities going on in the

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 forest and ag sector, but it was explicit that we
2 wanted low carbon fuel standard to have MSW-derived
3 feedstock, because we have emerging technologies for
4 lignocellulosic technology, whether it be acid
5 hydrolysis or enzymes, but it's coming.

6 And down in the San Joaquin Valley, working
7 on ag feedstock, there are some low carbon fuel coming
8 with lignocellulosic technologies which is biogenic,
9 which means it's ambient carbon, it's
10 non-anthropogenic, it's not petroleum based, it's
11 biogenic, and it's in nature. That's a good --
12 there's good CO2; biogenic is good CO2, and it's
13 local, so you don't have upstream ethanol things like
14 chlorine.

15 So by the emergence of the low carbon fuel
16 standard and having MSW feedstocks, part of it, that's
17 a good thing when the world is watching, and we
18 support that.

19 As a follow-up to that, on a statute side,
20 CRC is highly supportive of AB 222. For the first
21 time it defines biorefinery.

22 Right now if you look under the legal
23 definition of biological conversion -- some people
24 think it's disposal, some people -- it could be
25 transformation, it could be anything. There's a lot

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 of confusion out there about what is conversion
2 technology, what is biorefineries. But what we get
3 out of AB 222, it defines biorefineries for the first
4 time that allows this type of technology to emerge.
5 To explicitly count as disposal, you need to get a
6 permit from the Waste Board, and we create low carbon
7 fuel out of the 36 million tons of garbage that's in
8 the ground today, which most of it being organic.

9 So what the Waste Board staff is doing today
10 and the leadership here, we're highly supportive of.
11 We're doing the directive to include low carbon fuel
12 and biorefineries as part of the -- working with the
13 bioenergy interagency working group. Thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Are you suggesting
15 changes to the part of the strategic directives
16 specifically, or you're just supportive of No. 3,
17 which fosters the development of biofuels? You want
18 it specifically to state biofuels and low carbon fuel?

19 MR. EDGAR: I think biofuel is general
20 enough. I think as is, it gives that top-down general
21 framework that works great.

22 And even back when we were doing the
23 strategic directives from the stakeholder's position,
24 when Senator Chesbro was on the Board, he made it
25 explicit that AB 32 be part of the overarching aspects

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 of it, and I believe you did that already. So I think
2 from the top down, AB 32 was part of the SD -- I think
3 there's 12 of them, the 12-step program.

4 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Right. It's now going
5 to become the 13-step program. You're going to have
6 to amend yourself.

7 We did put climate change and global warming
8 as part of all of the strategic directives as an
9 overarching but felt, as we were moving through the
10 scoping plan, we need to set the bar a little bit
11 higher and specifically cull out what our activities
12 are and look for other opportunities, so I
13 appreciate that. Thanks, Evan.

14 MR. EDGAR: Thank you.

15 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Any questions for Evan?

16 (No audible response.)

17 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Okay. Our next speaker
18 is Nick Lapis.

19 MR. LAPIS: Good morning, Members. Nick
20 Lapis with Californians Against Waste.

21 I'd like to start by addressing the agenda
22 item that we didn't bring up today, which is the
23 contract allocation. It's something we were really
24 excited to support, and as soon as we have funding for
25 it again, we look forward to being in front of you and

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 supporting it. It's something very important for the
2 composting industry, and it's an area where the staff
3 really took initiative, and it was a good step
4 forward.

5 Back on this issue. We suggested about two
6 years ago that we add a specific strategic directive
7 for climate change, and we're glad to see that we're
8 finally getting on to doing that. And, previously, we
9 were incorporating it into all the strategic
10 directives, but it's nice to cull out the specific
11 actions that we want to address.

12 The things that are currently in the list of
13 the strategic directives are great, but for the most
14 part, they're all things that the staff is already
15 working on. And, traditionally, with strategic
16 directives we've really taken a broad look out. And
17 if you look at Strategic Directive 6.1, we set a very,
18 very strong 2020 goal.

19 Here I think that we're not necessarily
20 setting this type of goal for the future, we're
21 focusing on things that we're already doing. Now, I
22 realize that Staff resources are incredibly limited
23 and it's a tough time for Staff to branch out into new
24 areas, but we think that there are several things that
25 should be added to this in terms moving forward.

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 The first one is the Climate Action Team.
2 This is under the first bullet point. We previously
3 had a recycling and waste management subgroup of the
4 Climate Action Team. That no longer exists. We think
5 that now it's definitely the time to bring that back.
6 The recycling and waste management subgroup would be a
7 great opportunity for this state agency to work with
8 other state agencies on the areas where we have
9 expertise.

10 So, for example, if you look at the issue of
11 compost -- again, just an easy one to illustrate this
12 problem -- we have CDFA which is encouraging organic
13 fertilizers but doesn't necessarily know too much
14 about compost. We have the Water Board and DWR who
15 are looking at water efficiency measures both as
16 climate mitigation and as climate adaptation
17 strategies, and nobody over there knows anything about
18 compost. We have Caltrans that's buying materials to
19 use for its landscaping.

20 If you look beyond the issue of compost,
21 again, Caltrans, they're building roads. And guess
22 what, the Waste Board has deep knowledge about RAC,
23 about recycled aggregate, about building materials.
24 The list goes on and on for issues that the Waste
25 Board has specialty in that reduce greenhouse gases

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 that other agencies are working on but don't
2 necessarily know enough about. And we think it's a
3 good opportunity to reconstitute the recycling and
4 waste management subgroup and make it much stronger,
5 really have it be an opportunity for the staff to work
6 with their state counterparts and really push hard,
7 and it's something that we could do with existing
8 staff, no contract allocation, no additional funding,
9 but really be proactive on it, especially in the
10 issues of adaptation and agriculture.

11 Another thing that we think makes sense to
12 tackle as part of this strategic directive is a
13 slightly more controversial issue, and that's
14 alternative daily cover and the use of green waste of
15 alternative daily cover.

16 About a year ago, we had a work group to
17 discuss this issue, and nothing ever came of that. We
18 think it's one of the low hanging fruit, we're putting
19 organics in the landfill, and we should really be
20 pulling them out as part of our greenhouse gas
21 efforts. So it would be great if we could actually
22 take actions on that. We've studied it, we've had
23 work groups, we've done reports, we've talked it out
24 over and over and over, and now it's really before the
25 Board to actually do something.

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 The final item I would suggest adding is
2 encouraging food waste collection. If we're talking
3 about greenhouse gas impacts, there's nothing that
4 degrades faster in a landfill than food waste.
5 Similarly, the use of food waste that's been composted
6 or digested as a soil amendment reduces greenhouse
7 gases. This is really what we should be targeting,
8 whether it's commercial food waste or whether it's
9 residential food waste that's being co-collected with
10 green waste. I'm not sure what exactly to ask other
11 than the Board showing a strong support for it. Thank
12 you.

13 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: I think what you're
14 specifically asking for is some of these types of
15 projects be specifically culled out, a target on food
16 waste reduction somehow, by a certain -- a date
17 certain or, you know, the phaseout of alternative
18 daily cover. I think that's what you're looking for
19 in this set of directives.

20 MR. LAPIS: That would be more in line with
21 some of the other strategic directives that are really
22 looking forward and not just saying We're already
23 doing.

24 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Right.

25 MR. LAPIS: And the only thing I would

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 hesitate is maybe putting an explicit target, giving a
2 percentage. I'm not sure what impact that would have
3 on additionality analysis and carbon credits.

4 BOARD MEMBER LAIRD: Madam Chair, if I could
5 follow up with a question to the staff. And the
6 question is, is we had our workshop or -- around the
7 PowerPoint at the meeting recently, and it was very
8 clear coming out of the discussion that was had on the
9 dais that there would be more work done on some of the
10 specific things that were at issue.

11 In what form will that next come back to the
12 Board?

13 MR. LEVENSON: There will be various forms
14 in which it will come back to the Board, depending on
15 the nature of the particular measure that we are
16 working on.

17 For example, with the commercial recycling
18 measure -- and let me defer for a moment. I want to
19 address the next statement that these are things we're
20 already doing. There are things we have started on,
21 but most of these have 2020 goals and they are things
22 that are going to take a couple of years to actually
23 implement and get rolling, so we're just at the very
24 beginning of the process on most of these.

25 But with respect to reporting to you, for

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 example, commercial recycling, the mandatory measure,
2 we are having a couple of workshops next month, July
3 20th here and August 6, I believe, in Diamond Bar, and
4 we will be coming back to report to you in September.
5 And then a couple months later, we will be coming back
6 with draft language for your consideration to start a
7 formal rulemaking for next year. So that's one form
8 in which it will come back.

9 With anaerobic digestion -- and Nick is
10 absolutely correct -- the food waste is a critical
11 component of the waste stream. It's part of our
12 organics road map. We envision that as being dealt
13 with through the measures in here that related to
14 anaerobic digestion and increasing composting and
15 markets for organics. Of course that depends on
16 things like the contract that Nick spoke about and our
17 programmatic EIR, which is at risk now for anaerobic
18 digestion. So a lot of the things that we have in
19 place or starting to lay the groundwork for meeting
20 those measures are in jeopardy, and we're going to
21 have to figure out ways around it.

22 But we would -- next month we are planning
23 to have a panel discussion for you on anaerobic
24 digestion. It's just an initial panel discussion to
25 kind of get feedback from stakeholders as to what's

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 working or what seems feasible, and we would use the
2 input from that and your discussion to further craft
3 that measure. And so we have things like that that
4 are planned.

5 Now, we can more systematically come back to
6 you "X" -- periodically, whatever period is that you
7 prefer, with a memo or a directors' report that says
8 Here's where we are this quarter and this is what
9 we've achieved, here's what we've been unable to
10 achieve, here's the roadblocks that we've gotten. So
11 we're open to your direction on how to formally --

12 BOARD MEMBER LAIRD: If I can just follow
13 up. The reason that I asked that is that if you just
14 look conceptually how this Board came about and that
15 there was a 50 percent goal of diversion that was
16 established in 1989, at the time that goal was
17 established, I don't think anybody did the dissection
18 that, Jeez, we'll have to deal with re-refining motor
19 oils, we're going to have to deal with tires, even
20 though the act really helped pushed that consistently,
21 we're going to have to deal with cement and how do we
22 deal with that metal coming into the landfills,
23 beefing up recycling in ways that we hadn't thought
24 about and make mandatory. The point being that
25 establishing the goal forced the issue on a bunch of

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 things that weren't specifically culled out.

2 And I happen to generally agree with many of
3 the directions that Nick called out in his comments,
4 and my question is, is in our global strategic
5 directive, are we setting a goal that's stringent
6 enough that, in fact, all those things are going to
7 come back in a menu, because we're going to have to
8 consider how we're going to meet the goal or were we
9 light in setting the goal in a way that it was sort of
10 what we do already and it doesn't force some of those
11 issues? It seems to me that's at the heart of the
12 discussion that we're having right now.

13 And if we have a process that we set a clear
14 direction conceptually and a stringent goal and we do
15 have regular report backs or some regular structure to
16 feedback through the Board, then we can ask these
17 questions even if we don't specifically call them out
18 today, because we will know that we have to go in some
19 of those directions to meet the goal that we're
20 setting forth. And that seems to me to be at the
21 heart of what we're talking about today.

22 And now since everybody else said as an
23 aside contracting isn't on the agenda but we'll talk
24 about it, I would add that what the governor is doing
25 is just not appropriate for the Waste Board. Having a

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 non-general source of revenue and freezing contracts
2 makes no sense whatsoever. And understand their
3 argument that, Oh, but we have global cash flow
4 issues, and so we have to stop non-general fund things
5 to help our cash flow. But we collect from fee payers
6 things that have to be within the legal definition of
7 fee collection, and it's only appropriate -- all it
8 does is slow down work like exactly what we're talking
9 about in this directive, and it just doesn't make
10 sense for the Waste Board.

11 MR. LEVENSON: If I could speak a little bit
12 to the goal issue, Madam Chair. If you look at the
13 scoping plan, the various measures in the plan all
14 have an affiliated metric ton reduction -- most of the
15 measures do; a few of them are to be determined.
16 Cumulatively, they come to about 10 million metric
17 tons is what we're on the hook for. That may not be
18 aggressive enough for the Board and that is a
19 discussion that you might wish to have, but we can
20 certainly quantify those within the strategic
21 directive where we've already done them for the
22 specific measures and add them up.

23 But I would like to point out that even
24 reporting on progress towards those will be very
25 qualitative for several years. For example, the

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 commercial recycling measure again. It's probably the
2 one we can quantify best. We think that if we could
3 get about half of the large commercial businesses
4 recycling half of their materials, that's about
5 5 million metric tons of CO2 emissions reduction.
6 That's a substantial achievement. Could we get more
7 if we ramped up the percentages? Probably. But in
8 order to get there, we're going to have to go through
9 the rulemaking, implement the programs, and then have
10 a way to measure that in the years in which they're
11 being implemented. So we really will have qualitative
12 markers for a while until we get to that point several
13 years down the line where programs are truly being
14 implemented and measured, and that's probably true for
15 most of the measures.

16 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: But I think there's also
17 an opportunity -- to piggyback on John's early
18 comments about this being a "top-down, it's just what
19 we do," we also are counting, and we're looking in
20 that direction.

21 We can look at -- and maybe it's for a
22 discussion next month or next week, but we can look at
23 the number of jurisdictions who implement programs as
24 a goal as opposed to just a number of million metric
25 tons. I mean, if we move "X" percentage of our

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 jurisdictions throughout the state to a commercial
2 recycling ordinance or, you know, by "X" day or
3 certain number of jurisdictions that are implementing
4 a pilot food waste collection program to feed into
5 anaerobic digestion.

6 I mean, I will say I am extremely
7 disappointed that our anaerobic digestion EIR is on
8 hold, and I know that's a huge priority, so we will do
9 what we can to make sure that moves as expeditiously
10 as possible once we're allowed to do that. But I
11 think we can get creative here as well to look at
12 opportunities rather than measure things in million
13 metric tons, measure them in success for, you know,
14 rolling these things out as well, so there's an
15 opportunity for that.

16 BOARD MEMBER MULÉ: I agree. I think
17 there's different ways that we can measure -- you
18 know, different metrics that we can use in order to
19 measure our success here. So, again, I completely
20 agree with the Chair and Member Laird. It's how --
21 you know, let's not have blinders on, let's really
22 broaden our focus here because, again, there's all
23 kinds of ways we can look at measuring success.

24 I love the Chair's idea of looking at a
25 number of jurisdictions that, you know, pilot food

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 waste programs or expand their composting infracture
2 or whatever. I mean, there's different ways that we
3 can look at measuring success.

4 BOARD MEMBER LAIRD: Just one -- or a couple
5 things: One is in our workshop, there was an issue
6 still of the Air Board not counting enough of what we
7 do toward the scope and plan and their efforts, and I
8 think that's why it's important to start figuring out
9 how we're going to measure because it gets counted by
10 the Air Board. And I would like to say that
11 10 million metric tons is a good place to start, but
12 until we know exactly how we count certain things, we
13 might decide that there's another place to go with the
14 number.

15 And I would suggest that once we refine the
16 issue of counting, we want a number that's higher.
17 You know, we want a number that forces those other
18 processes, some of the things that Nick talked about.
19 And I think we sort of based on what we know now chose
20 this number, but I would reserve the right to say that
21 at whatever the appropriate point is, we might want to
22 change the number as we have more facts on how
23 counting is done. And I also -- Santa Cruz being that
24 place where, as I was fond of saying when I was mayor,
25 there was 50,000 people; 100,000 opinions.

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 I have been meeting with different groups
2 that are developing scenarios for how to count
3 emissions. And there was one guy in particular that
4 is working with regional councils of government across
5 the state and municipalities on how best to establish
6 the baselines and how best to count what you do going
7 forward, and I think it's going to be important to
8 utilize that as part of this so that our benchmark is
9 one that we know is something that we can stick with.

10 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: I will start the
11 comment, and, Brenda, you'll probably have to chime in
12 on Nick's suggestion on reconstituting the recycling
13 and waste management subgroup.

14 We have engaged with the Air Board on that
15 and continue to engage in the importance of continuing
16 that as opposed to us folding into local government
17 and energy. We'll continue it. Well, actually, maybe
18 now is the opportunity to ask if we can reconstitute
19 it as an informal part of continuing the dialogue to
20 help us implement this part, that it's not necessarily
21 a formal part of the CAT but it is an integral part of
22 our implementation of recycling measures that can be
23 utilized by other state agencies. So I'll talk to
24 Mary as well since we have a meeting this afternoon.

25 MS. SMYTH: I actually have had a couple

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 meetings with agency and ARB on this about the fact
2 that we no longer have a recycling and waste
3 management CAT subgroup with the re-org of the
4 interagency working groups there.

5 And the compromise that we agreed might be
6 best and that we are trying to work with right now is
7 that they have elected us to be on the CAT oversight
8 subgroup, which is a special overarching subgroup.
9 You've got the ag subgroup, the water, forest, and
10 different subgroups. But this one is an oversight
11 with the CAT principals on the team. They're looking
12 at the interconnections between the other subgroups,
13 which I had the opportunity to sit in on the first
14 service site meeting for that and also was able to
15 talk about anaerobic digestion and food waste and the
16 fact that we have this measure in the scoping plan,
17 that we definitely need help from all of our sister
18 agencies to be able to accomplish it.

19 Because of some of the other metrics
20 associated with the measure, its 2 million metric tons
21 of CO2, its 90 facilities by 2020; that's a lot of
22 facilities. And I made the connections to ag, to
23 water, to energy, to food waste, and to how all of our
24 interagency groups are relating. So that was a huge
25 opportunity for me to pitch those connections. That's

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 where we're at right now with the subgroup resolution.

2 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: That's good. Thank you.
3 Sheila?

4 BOARD MEMBER KUEHL: Well, I've been trying
5 to figure out how to kind of meld the information that
6 we're not allowed to spend our money with the
7 emissions that we have and how ironic it is that so
8 many of the special funds relate to the environmental
9 arena, which means that if you look overall, I mean,
10 we're talking about an overarching approach to
11 reducing greenhouse gas emissions at a time when, not
12 just our hands, but so many other hands will be tied
13 to really do anything that can't be done within our
14 current staff which is stretched to the max anyway and
15 underappreciated day to day.

16 So I think in terms of our particular part
17 of this, it's also, I guess, not ironic but kind of
18 just a given that the participation of this sector in
19 the reduction of greenhouse gas or the participation
20 of this sector that is all the waste management and
21 recycling issues in the whole idea of the
22 environmental movement is also underappreciated, and I
23 think --

24 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Agree.

25 BOARD MEMBER KUEHL: -- understood because

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 as people say, you know, Well, let's see what I know
2 about my trash: I put it out, and they take it away.
3 And "away" is something that is not defined for
4 virtually anybody who is just not engaged in the
5 process.

6 I don't think there's necessarily an answer,
7 but I do think that what we do, then, becomes even
8 more important because hardly anybody cares about it
9 but us. So it's very important. I thank the people
10 who speak and work on this every day and people who
11 haven't spoken and work on this every day.

12 And I think that in the strategic directives
13 themselves, I would like us to -- so long as we're
14 setting a goal, even with our hands tied, I would like
15 us to be able to be more specific even if it's just in
16 culling out the bottom half of the page about what we
17 might do specifically in the area of food waste and
18 green waste.

19 I had a long talk with Wes when I had
20 indicated I really wanted to be on this board about
21 alternative daily cover and kind of what that meant
22 and how to deal with it, and I still don't personally
23 have enough experience to figure out if it's better
24 to, you know, end it and do something else with it in
25 terms of the green waste or whether the alternative

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 has something to recommend as well.

2 So I don't think I would be prepared to, you
3 know, add something specific in our strategic
4 directives. And I guess I also wonder is there
5 something in addition to what we do in the landfills
6 and alternative energy and biofuels that relates to
7 the emission of greenhouse gases. I've been --

8 BOARD MEMBER MULÉ: Absolutely.

9 BOARD MEMBER KUEHL: I've been unnaturally
10 quiet this morning because I've been kind of doodling
11 in my mind, trying to figure out if there's yet
12 another aspect of our work that relates to greenhouse
13 gas emissions. But, I mean, that's landfill. And
14 methane capture is also in its own way energy because
15 it's not just capture but conversion. So I think
16 we've covered it in a way.

17 But, I don't know, is there any other way
18 that our sector relates to greenhouse gas emissions
19 that is not about landfills or the creation of energy
20 from waste? The answer may be no. Is there any big
21 corner that we're missing here?

22 MS. SMYTH: I think you're right. We have
23 landfill methane emission reduction, we have our
24 measures that are trying to intercept the organics
25 before they ever get to the landfill and instead of

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 allowing that energy production to occur over a
2 30-year, or more, life of a landfill, to occur in a
3 more expeditious process.

4 But, then, the other thing that we've come a
5 long way with our sister agency at ARB is, when we
6 first started climate change, we looked at, Well,
7 where are the emissions happening? And so landfills
8 were immediately pointed, we've got to do something
9 about landfills and that's the Waste Board sector, and
10 they stopped.

11 But I think the other thing that we are just
12 trying to penetrate now and I think we are doing so
13 with ARB is how can we achieve emission reduction. So
14 if we change the way we do business, that means we
15 don't burn a ton of CO2 fossil fuel.

16 We've been able to effect an emission
17 reduction in climate change, and that is our
18 recycling. And it's a very difficult one. We've all
19 kind of talked about how difficult that is in
20 assessing and measuring, and we are working with ARB
21 on that because when you take that material that would
22 normally end up in a landfill, whether it be tires or
23 electronics or paper or what it is, and you bring it
24 back to the front of the manufacturing stream, you're
25 no longer harvesting virgin materials and you're

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 backing down, essentially, fossil fuel energy input
2 there. But where does that occur?

3 And I think you said it, Board Member Kuehl,
4 as to, Well, we put it out on the curb, and then where
5 does it really go; right? And so we're trying to,
6 number one, get better assessment tools in our pockets
7 on how to quantify those GHGs that are associated with
8 recycling and then also to the degree we can, where do
9 they occur and how does that affect California now and
10 the WCI region. That's not an easy goal. And I think
11 originally the ARB was not interested in that, but I
12 think now they are.

13 And we have a community protocol that will
14 be the sister protocol to the local government
15 protocol which has already been adopted. The ARB is
16 working on the community protocol. We're partnering
17 with them on that and providing input. It's just
18 getting out of the chute that they've promised to look
19 at recycling with the new lands with GHG emission
20 reduction potential where we can actually come to the
21 table and not be, you know, squeezing on a point
22 source but actually contributing to emission
23 reductions by getting the materials out of a landfill
24 and putting them in the recycling stream.

25 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: It might be a little bit

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 more -- I understand what you're saying, but I think
2 as we keep going and talking about recycling, maybe it
3 would be helpful or maybe it won't and it will just be
4 a futile exercise, but what about looking throughout
5 the CAT and looking at what water quality savings and
6 reductions the Water Board needs to do and be able to
7 quantify, if they utilize recycled compost, how the
8 benefits increase exponentially as opposed to just
9 using any other measure and sort of point to the other
10 reductions and show how our reductions can
11 exponentially boost theirs by utilizing recycled
12 materials as opposed to virgin asphalt for the
13 production of roads? Caltrans can exponentially
14 increase their reduction benefits by using RAC because
15 it's a recycled content product as opposed to virgin
16 material extraction.

17 BOARD MEMBER KUEHL: I also don't know if
18 there's been any -- and this is a smaller matter, and
19 it sort of gets down to the micro level -- but if
20 there's been any analysis about transportation.

21 I mean, just in my small city, for
22 instance -- or, actually, here in Sacramento as
23 well -- where we put out mixed recycling in the
24 containers. There's been encouragement not to put the
25 container out until it's full. And the reason is

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 because it lessens the number of stops that any
2 particular pick-up truck makes. And, you know, like
3 in one block, that doesn't save you much. But the
4 truth is, you know, they don't turn off their motors,
5 and so it's just like idling at the porch, which we
6 found was an enormous contributor to greenhouse gas.
7 And it's a small thing, but, again, adding the
8 transportation issue. I don't even know if that's
9 been assessed or if it's worth it, but a notion like
10 looking at these other sort of unexplored larger
11 areas, like you were talking about, if there's a way
12 to -- I'm certain that in the general we already have
13 them in the strategic directive in a way, but if we
14 want to cull out our responsibility for -- at the
15 micro level.

16 BOARD MEMBER MULÉ: If I can just jump in at
17 this point, I can tell you that the hauling entities
18 are looking at that. They have been and they continue
19 to look at that from, you know, the largest corporate
20 companies down to the individual and local government
21 haulers as well. I mean, they are looking at those
22 kinds of things because, as we all know here,
23 transportation does make up the largest source of
24 greenhouse gas emission, and so I do know that.

25 You know, again, from the hauling

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 perspective, they are looking at that aspect of
2 perhaps educating their customers to only put out
3 their bins when they're full so they don't have to
4 stop. It sounds like it's not much of a savings, but
5 then, as you mention, if you go out --

6 BOARD MEMBER KUEHL: (Inaudible).

7 BOARD MEMBER MULÉ: Exactly. Each truck
8 does anywhere from 800 to 1,200 homes a day; that can
9 add up.

10 So I think those are the kinds of things as
11 we -- as this whole AB 32 initiative is evolving, I
12 think that we are starting to look at these things a
13 little bit more in much more detail than when we had
14 when we started just a few years ago.

15 MR. LEVENSON: Yeah, we would definitely
16 agree. I think in terms of the local government
17 protocol, as you mentioned, Member Mulé, we're
18 involved in that workgroup and getting those kinds of
19 comments. I may be not as explicit and as obvious,
20 but we're definitely involved in that.

21 I think the -- either the reconstitution of
22 the recycling and waste management subgroup, whether
23 informally or the -- our involvement in the oversight
24 group will allow us to make some of those linkages.

25 For example, with the Department of Water

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 Resources, we've got work going on with them, to the
2 extent that they're willing, to incorporate soil
3 amendments as one of the water conservation practices,
4 and there's a number of other activities other
5 agencies are undertaking where we're at least -- we
6 may not be there at the table on a day-to-day basis,
7 just giving what we can do or the relative priorities,
8 but we're there making those linkages and asking them
9 to be aware of it and incorporate those kinds of
10 things into their decision-making.

11 BOARD MEMBER MULÉ: Thank you, Madam Chair.
12 I guess from my perspective, I just want to address
13 Nick's recommendation to reconstitute the recycling
14 subgroup. At first I thought the same thing. I was
15 very upset that they disbanded that subgroup, but now
16 in listening to Brenda, I think that we might even
17 have a greater opportunity to impact what we do from a
18 cross-agency perspective by participating in this
19 oversight group.

20 And so I think that, again, if we all
21 continue to be focused as to what our goals are and
22 what we want to achieve, I think that we might able to
23 provide a greater impact through working through the
24 oversight group as opposed to having a separate silo
25 for recycling activities. Again, we can have that

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 greater impact across the Board.

2 MS. SMYTH: And that was part of the
3 discussion with the ARB and agency is that we can
4 reach more ears because all the CAT principals are
5 there. If we have a recycling and waste management
6 subgroup -- certainly there's pros and cons both ways,
7 but we would not have as many principals visiting our
8 subgroup as we did with the other subgroup.

9 BOARD MEMBER MULÉ: Yeah, I think it's
10 great.

11 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: The other thing, I think
12 we sort of get caught in the putting too much or not
13 enough in the strategic directives and what the focus
14 of the directives is, is supposed to be the high
15 level, set the goal, and the staff does the
16 implementation plan which is the second part of, you
17 know, for the purpose of discussion outlines the tasks
18 that are being undertaken for Subdirective 2.

19 What I would like to suggest -- because a
20 lot of what people see is in the directives, not in
21 the staff work plan -- if we choose to move this
22 forward and adopt this, come back next month with an
23 opportunity to maybe talk about and add to these and
24 populate it a little bit. I think that what we're
25 doing is important and I think, you know, people don't

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 look beyond the directives into the staff work plan
2 and how we're going to implement these directives, and
3 we'd like to at least acknowledge and say some of the
4 key things.

5 For instance, the organics road map, which
6 you mentioned, Howard, a lot of what Nick has asked
7 for is in our organics road map, which is a document
8 that we do, and the food waste, but it's not one that
9 everybody looks at like they look at our strategic
10 directives. And I think we need to at least have an
11 opportunity to cull out a few of our priority measures
12 in the top line of what we're doing.

13 So we can get together maybe before the
14 Board meeting, if we can do that; otherwise, bring it
15 back to the agenda in July because there's an
16 opportunity in July as well to sort of noodle on it
17 and figure out where we want to cull out specific
18 items.

19 John?

20 BOARD MEMBER LAIRD: I agree. I'm just
21 trying to think. You know, my instinct is, is it
22 might be good just to do it in July and just feel like
23 we have the time and anybody that wishes to give any
24 input does it.

25 And I feel obligated to say too there's been

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 such good discussion that sort of by reference the
2 direction that has come from all the different talks
3 here is direction that we feel as a Board and are
4 things that we are going to want to do. And that
5 while we should maybe see if we want to reference
6 additional things specifically in the list and, as the
7 Chair said, things that we might be doing in the
8 organics road map and other things already, just call
9 them out here as well. That gives us a chance maybe
10 to just take input rather than just do it quickly in
11 front of next week's meeting. And so I don't know
12 what the best way is to proceed, but I think that
13 would be the best course of action.

14 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: I would prefer that. I
15 think it gives us much more thoughtful product, and so
16 we can move this as strategic directives. The second
17 part is not part of the strategic directives, it's
18 just the value statement and the four points here, and
19 then direct Staff will put an agenda item on in July
20 that we can refine and put some priority programs into
21 our strategic directives with some measurable goals.

22 BOARD MEMBER LAIRD: Then if we were to do a
23 motion to implement what you just said, what do you
24 want in a motion?

25 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: That is -- I mean, I

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

1 think that's probably sufficient to move the strategic
2 directive as -- as stated in Agenda Item 11.

3 BOARD MEMBER LAIRD: And have the item come
4 back next month as you outlined.

5 Then I would move, then.

6 BOARD MEMBER MULÉ: Second.

7 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: It's been moved and
8 seconded.

9 Kristen, can you call the roll.

10 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT GARNER: Kuehl?

11 BOARD MEMBER KUEHL: Aye.

12 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT GARNER: Laird?

13 BOARD MEMBER LAIRD: Aye.

14 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT GARNER: Migden?

15 BOARD MEMBER MIGDEN: Aye.

16 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT GARNER: Mulé?

17 BOARD MEMBER MULÉ: Aye.

18 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT GARNER: Brown?

19 CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Aye.

20 So we can put that on consent, but we'd be
21 happy to pull it off the consent agenda if anybody has
22 any critical issues that we can continue to discuss on
23 Tuesday.

24 I think that concludes our meeting. Thank
25 you all very much.

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

(Whereupon the Strategic Policy
Development Committee adjourned at
10:59 a.m.)

--o0o--

**Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed
and approved for accuracy.**

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, HE SUK JONG, a Certified Shorthand
Reporter of the State of California, do hereby
certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein;
that the foregoing hearing was reported in shorthand
by me, He Suk Jong, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of
the State of California, and thereafter transcribed
into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of counsel
or attorney for any of the parties to said hearing nor
in any way interested in the outcome of said hearing.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
hand this 22nd day of June, 2009, at Sacramento,
California.

HE SUK JONG, CSR NO. 12918
Certified Shorthand Reporter